



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/753,698 | 01/03/2001 | Nobuyoshi Ninokata | FUJO 18.157 | 1587 |

26304 7590 05/06/2004

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN
575 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585

EXAMINER

OSMAN, RAMY M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2157

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/753,698

Applicant(s)

NINOKATA ET AL.

Examiner

Ramy M Osman

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,12,13,15,16 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-11,14,17 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1,2,15,16 and 19-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saigo et al. (US Patent No. 6,587,880) in view of Luzeski et al. (US Patent No. 6,404,762).

3. In reference to claims 1,15,19,20,22,24 and 25, Saigo teaches session management apparatus managing a session of an information process through a network, comprising:

a plurality of communications devices transmitting and receiving data; a plurality of users receiving session information; an integral management system performing session management.
(Summary and columns 4-6)

Saigo fails to explicitly teach interface devices corresponding to plurality of media and performing session management on a session of two or more media. However, Luzeski discloses user interface devices with a plurality of media (columns 5, 6 lines 14-55, and 7 lines 7-40), integrating the plurality of media into a universal messaging system and performing session management on the plurality of media for the purpose of consolidating media presentation and management (summary and column 6 line 55 – column 12 line 67).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Saigo by making the plurality of users correspond to a plurality of media,

Art Unit: 2157

integrate the plurality of media into unified messaging session and make the integral management system perform session management on the session as per the teachings of Luzeski for the purpose of consolidating media presentation and management.

4. In reference to claims 2,16,21 and 23, Saigo teaches the management system performing session management which includes starting a new session, identifying session and ending a session (summary and columns 4,5,11 and 12).

5. Claims 12 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saigo et al. (US Patent No. 6,587,880) in view of Luzeski et al. (US Patent No. 6,404,762) in further view of Bauer et al. (US Patent No. 6,690,788).

6. In reference to claim 12, Saigo in view of Luzeski teach the session management system as described above. Saigo in view of Luzeski fail to explicitly teach wherein the plurality of interface devices are a mail communications device, a Web communications device and a voice communications device. However, Bauer teaches integrated work management for mail, Web and voice communications devices in the form of PC, telephone, fax and scanner communication devices which can transmit and receive email, Web and voice data (columns 4&5 and figure 1).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the communications devices mail, web and voice communication devices as per the teachings of Bauer so that they can receive session information for the purpose of session presentation and management as described above.

Art Unit: 2157

7. In reference to claim 13, Saigo teaches the management system performing session management which includes starting a new session, identifying session and ending a session (summary and columns 4,5,11 and 12).

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 3-11,14,17 and 18 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The following limitations if rewritten into the independent claims would indicate allowable subject matter:

A process device performing an information process while inheriting said unified session information;

Said integral management device stores plural pieces of additional identification information corresponding to results of a plurality of individual processes belonging to the session using the two or more media, and instructs said process device to perform a process based on a result of an individual information process corresponding to selected additional identification information, which is selected by a user from among the plural pieces of additional identification information, when unified session information including the selected additional identification information is received.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramy M Osman whose telephone number is (703) 305-8050. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9AM to 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 305-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RMO
April 29, 2004


ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100